

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 are presently active in this case and are amended by the present amendment, Claim 3 having been canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because it consisted of more than 150 words; Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shapiro et al., (USP 4,225,787); and Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al., (USP 4,225,787) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Koichi (JP 05-114497) - based on machine English language translation provided.

In light of the outstanding grounds for rejection, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and thereby more clearly patentably define over the cited prior art references. To that end, Claim 1 has been amended to accentuate that drive conditions of an X-ray tube are decided by the following:

- (1) storage of drive conditions of a plurality of types of X-ray tubes, and
- (2) application of a voltage (current) lower than these drive conditions which is applied to a stator coil.

Support for the changes to Claims 1 and 2 is found at page 8, line 16 to page 10, line 24 of the specification, for example. No new matter has been added.

According to the claimed invention, the power consumption or current consumed upon application of a voltage or current lower than operating conditions for the various types of X-ray tubes is determined and compared with a stored condition. In performing the measurement and comparison, it is not necessary that actual anode rotation occur. Instead, by

performing the measurement and comparison by means of a voltage (current) lower than these drive conditions which is applied to a stator coil during normal operation, rotation of anode is not needed.

On the contrary, both Shapiro and Koichi detect a rotational speed of the motor in a state in which full power is applied to the X-ray tube. Specifically, Shapiro teaches use of a photoelectric sensor for detection. Instead of a photoelectric sensor, Koichi teaches detection of reactive power or power factor of a stator coil driven in full operation. Neither of the cited references teaches --a control unit supplying a lower level power than the drive conditions to an X-ray tube to detect a power consumed in the stator coil and determining whether a selected one of the drive conditions stored in the memory unit and a condition of the detected consumed power match or not--.

In view of this significant difference, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding ground for rejection has been overcome and that the amended claims patentably define over the cited references.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be

in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\EHK\27\sl\272635\272635US-AMENDMENT-8.11.07.DOC